

PTO/SB/21 (08-03)

Approved for use through 7/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

AF.
2833**TRANSMITTAL
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Application Number	09/732,120
Filing Date	12/07/2000
First Named Inventor	Radosavljevic
Group Art Unit	2833
Examiner Name	Luebke, Renee S.
Attorney Docket Number	905-124

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)

<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request

<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request

<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement

<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)

<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 | <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers
<input type="checkbox"/> Petition
<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application
<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address
<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer

<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund
<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group
<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information

<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter

<input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): |
|--|--|---|

Remarks

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0289.

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm and Individual name	Wall Marjama & Bilinski, LLP Daniel P. Malley	Reg. No. 43,443
Signature		
Date	January 20, 2004	

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING


I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this date:

January 20, 2004

Typed or printed name	Kathryn A. Watson	Date	January 20, 2004
Signature			

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Radosavljevic et al.

Serial No: 09/732,120

Filing Date: 12/07/2000


Title: SLIDE SWITCH FOR FAN
CONTROL

Group Art Unit: 2833

Examiner: Luebke, Renee S.

RESPONSE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail addressed to Mail Stop: Reply Brief, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on January 20, 2004.


Kathryn A. Watson

Attention: Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences
Assistant Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

Dear Sir:

REPLY BRIEF

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.193, Appellants hereby reply to the new points of argument raised in the Examiner's Answer (Answer) dated November 20, 2004. You are hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 50-0289 for any other necessary fees.

NEW POINTS OF ARGUMENT RAISED IN ANSWER AND APPELLANTS' REPLY

1. Examiner's New Point of Argument:

On page 2 of the Answer, in paragraph 5, the Examiner argues that the Appellants Summary of Invention is only "substantially correct." In particular, the Examiner states that "there is no disclosure (or claim) that 'resistor-capacitor (RC) circuit is also mounted

on circuit board 15. Nor is there any disclosure that the RC network and all other components are interconnected by electrical traces disposed in and on circuit board 15.’ ”

Appellants’ Reply:

The Appellants respectfully disagree. Presumably, the Examiner makes this argument because of the need to be consistent with her idiosyncratic definition of what a circuit board is. As pointed out repeatedly by the Appellants, everyone of ordinary skill in the art knows what a circuit board is. Further, no one of ordinary skill in the art would make a differentiation between a “circuit board” and a “printed circuit board.” These terms are synonymous and further, the Examiner has failed to point to any evidence in the body of knowledge generally available to those of ordinary skill in the art in support of her idiosyncratic definition of a circuit board. Having said that, the Appellants now point to the disclosure that shows an RC circuit and other components being interconnected on circuit board 15.

Circuit board 15 is shown in Figure 1. Figure 1 also shows a resistor mounted on the circuit board. Figure 5 shows two rows of contacts 22 mounted on circuit board 15. The text states that the labeling in Figure 5 “corresponds to the schematic of Fig. 6.” Figure 6 is a schematic that shows both RC circuits and other components being electrically connected. Taken together, the RC circuits and other components in the schematic are, in fact, disposed on the circuit board 15. Further, the disclosure does not have to explicitly describe the traces in the circuit board because it is well settled that a patent need not teach, and preferably omits, what is known in the art. *Spectra-Physics, Inc. v. Coherent, Inc.*, 3 USPQ2d 1737 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The use of traces to interconnect components disposed on a circuit board is known in the art. What is not known in the art, is the combination of features recited in the claims.

2. Examiner’s New Point of Argument

On page 4 of the Answer, the Examiner argues that her description of bottom plate 10d as a circuit board is not a mis-identification. The Examiner states “Appellant argues that since Takano does not call the structure a circuit board, then it cannot be one.

This is merely a matter of semantics. The name that one patentee chooses to give a structure does not eliminate other names for the structure.”

Appellant’s Reply:

The Appellants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. The Appellants are not relying on semantics. The Appellants are relying on the plain language of the specification. As pointed out in Appellants’ Brief, the inventor states that reference numeral 10d is a bottom plate, and not a circuit board. On the other hand, it appears as if the Examiner is using semantics when she asserts that: “the member is a board and it supports portions (i.e. contacts and leads) of a circuit. It is therefore a circuit board.”

Appellants make the following observations. First of all, semantically speaking, a board is a rigid piece of flat wood. Element 10d is not a rigid piece of flat wood, therefore, it is not a board. Second, while the Appellants agree that element 10d is used for support, it does not make it a circuit board because it does not electrically interconnect any components. Finally, the Appellants respectfully point out that the best person to know what a component is, in this case element 10d, is the inventor, not the Examiner. Takano calls element 10d a bottom plate and teaches that bottom plate 10d is a part of housing 10. Col. 4, lines 17 – 22. The Examiner’s attempt to pass off plate 10d as a circuit board strains credulity.

In the Appeal Brief, the Appellants pointed out that the Examiner attempts to give a meaning to the term “circuit board” that is repugnant to the usual and ordinary meaning of the term.

3. Examiner’s New Point of Argument

On page 4 of the Answer, the Examiner argues that conductors 22 are circuit board “traces.”

Appellant’s Reply:

Appellants again respectfully point out that the inventor identifies elements 22 as being contact strips. Appellants also respectfully point out that Figure 1 and Figure 6 do not portray elements 22 as circuit board traces. Instead, they look like what the patentee says they are, namely, contact strips. Further, they cannot be traces because they do not interconnect anything on plate 10d, which the Examiner mistakenly identifies as a circuit board.

4. Examiner's New Point of Argument

The Examiner attempts to refute the Appellants' observation that Takano lacks circuitry by stating that "a circuit is merely a means of transmitting electrical signals from one place to another."

Appellant's Reply:

Appellants respectfully point out that the Examiner's definition is not accurate. In fact, the Examiner provides a definition for a transmission line. A circuit is, in fact, a closed path that may be traversed by an electric current. The closed path typically includes a configuration of electrical components, such as resistors, capacitors, inductors, or solid state devices. Referring to Figure 1 and Figure 6, and all the associated text, Takano does not include a circuit of any kind.

5. Examiner's New Point of Argument

The Examiner states that Appellants have not indicated any claimed limitation that is not met by the device shown by Takano.

Appellant's Reply:

The Appellants respectfully disagree. As evidenced by the above arguments and the arguments provided in the Appeal Brief, Appellants have shown that Takano does not disclose the circuit board as recited by claim 1. Appellants have shown that Takano does not disclose a slide switch for a circuit disposed on a circuit board, as recited in claim 1. Appellants have shown that Takano does not disclose a plurality of contacts mounted on

a circuit board, as recited in claim 1. Finally, Appellants have shown that Takano does not disclose a glider housing for disposition on a circuit board, as recited by claim 1.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) because the Examiner has failed to point out where Takano discloses the claimed invention. Claim 2 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1.

6. Examiner's New Point of Argument

In response to Appellants' pointing to established precedent, i.e., that "the PTO may not properly combine prior art references in order to establish *prima facie* obviousness unless there is some suggestion for doing so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art," the Examiner argues that "contrary to appellants' assertion that the examiner must point to where the prior art suggests the desirability of combining references, the motivation for combination may also be found in knowledge available to the general public."

Appellants' Reply:

Appellants respectfully request that the Examiner point to at least one body of knowledge generally available to those of ordinary skill in the art in support for her assertions. The point the Appellants made in the Appeal Brief is that the Examiner cannot point to any portion of the cited references or to any body of knowledge generally available to those of ordinary skill in the art in support for her assertions. On the other hand, the Appellants pointed out that the combination was improper because the proposed modification changes the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, and because the proposed modification renders the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. The Examiner did not respond to these arguments.

6. Examiner's New Point of Argument

The Examiner repeatedly states that each of the features recited in the claims are well known.

Appellants' Reply:

The Appellants respond by noting that while the Examiner asserts that each of the features recited in the claims are well known, she provides no evidence to back her assertions. Appellants have shown that Takano does not disclose each element of independent claim 1. Appellants have also pointed out that the Hanna reference does not supply the claim elements missing from Takano. Further, the Examiner has failed to point out where Hanna teaches the all of the limitations of claims 5 or 6. Claim 5 specifically recites all of the terminal connections of the claimed switch. For example, one claim element states that "said switch having a second position where an electrical connection is made between said first and second terminals through a first capacitance." The Examiner has failed to point out where this limitation, and the other limitations in claim 5 can be found in the cited references. Claim 6 has similar limitations. The Examiner has also failed to point out where these limitations can be found. Instead, the Examiner merely states that Hanna includes a RC circuit. As pointed out repeatedly, this is not enough to sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

7. Examiner's New Point of Argument

The Examiner provides PTO provided boilerplate to refute Appellants' arguments that she is engaging in improper hindsight. However, the Examiner does not answer the crux of Appellants' arguments.

Appellants' Reply:

The Appellants pointed out in the Appeal Brief that the Examiner, with the claims in mind, has selected and joined isolated parts of the references to assert that Applicant's invention would have been obvious. Appellants further pointed out that one of ordinary skill in the art would not replace Takano's bus bar arrangement with discrete terminals because Takano is specifically directed to bus bar type switches. Col. 1, lines 10 – 15. Further, because Takano is directed to a simple switch having no internal circuits, one of ordinary skill in the art would not seek to incorporate the RC network of Hanna in

Takano. Clearly, the Examiner is using impermissible hindsight to assert that the present invention is obvious in light of the combined references by selecting and joining isolated parts of the references to assert Applicant's invention would have been obvious. The Examiner does not answer these arguments.

8. Examiner's New Point of Argument

With regard to the Appellants' argument that the proposed combination does not have a reasonable expectation of success, the Examiner repeats her assertion that "all of the features are well known." Thus, she argues, "there is no reason not to expect success in combining these features." The Examiner also states that "applicant has not shown that one of ordinary skill would have difficulty combining the references.

Appellants' Reply:


Quite to the contrary, Appellants respectfully point out that the Appeal Brief provided reasons why there was no reasonable expectation of success, and why one of ordinary skill would have difficulty combining the references. Specifically, the Appellants pointed out that the Examiner has failed to show how Takano could reasonably accommodate the proposed modifications. In particular, the Appellants pointed out that the Examiner had failed to show how Takano could function suitably if the RC network of Hanna were included in Takano. Because RC networks are designed with certain circuits or features in mind, it is at best, improbable that the RC network of Hanna would have the right electrical properties relative to the Takano invention. Further, the contact arrangement in Hanna would not be a suitable replacement for the bus bars used in Takano. The replacement arrangement would not work unless Takano were re-designed into something that would not be recognized as being Takano's switch. The Examiner does not answer these pointed arguments.

In view of the foregoing, and additionally for the reasons set forth in the appellant's Appeal Brief, the final rejection of the claims should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

WALL MARJAMA & BILINSKI

Date: 1/20/09



Daniel P. Malley

Registration No. 43,443

WALL MARJAMA & BILINSKI

101 S. Salina Street

Suite 400

Syracuse, NY 13202

(607) 256-7307